

Vegetation patterns in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem

An improved land cover classification using
Landsat TM imagery and wilderness botanical surveys



J. T. Hogg, N. S. Weaver, J. J. Craighead, B. M. Steele,
M. L. Pokorny, M. H. Mahr, R. L. Redmond, F. B. Fisher



Recommended citation for this publication:

Hogg, J.T., N. S. Weaver, J. J. Craighead, B. M. Steele, M. L. Pokorny, M. H. Mahr, R. L. Redmond, F. B. Fisher. 2001. *Vegetation patterns in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem: An improved land cover classification using Landsat TM imagery and wilderness botanical surveys*. Craighead Wildlife-Wildlands Institute Monograph Number 2, Missoula, MT. 98 pp.

Cover photo: Bighorn Crags, Frank Church River-of-No-Return Wilderness, Idaho (J. Coop).

© 2001 by Craighead Wildlife-Wildlands Institute

Author affiliations:

J. T. Hogg^{1,4}

N. S. Weaver¹

J. J. Craighead¹

B. M. Steele²

M. L. Pokorny^{1,5}

M. H. Mahr^{1,6}

R. L. Redmond³

F. B. Fisher³

¹ Craighead Wildlife-Wildlands Institute, 5200 Upper Miller Creek Road, Missoula, MT 59803

² Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812

³ Wildlife Spatial Analysis Lab, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812

⁴ Current address: Montana Conservation Science Institute, Ltd., 5200 Upper Miller Creek Road, Missoula, MT 59803

⁵ Current address: Land Resources and Environmental Sciences, Montana State University, 334 Leon Johnson Hall, Bozeman, MT 59717

⁶ Current address: Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative, 710 Ninth Street, Canmore, AB T1W 2V7 Canada



Vegetation patterns in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem:

**An improved land cover classification using
Landsat TM imagery and wilderness botanical surveys**

**J. T. Hogg, N. S. Weaver, J. J. Craighead, B. M. Steele,
M. L. Pokorny, M. H. Mahr, R. L. Redmond, F. B. Fisher**

**Craighead Wildlife-Wildlands Institute Monograph Number 2
Missoula, Montana**



2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
STUDY AREA	2
METHODS	2
Botanical Data	2
Sources	2
Sampling Design	2
Land Cover Classification Systems	4
Summary of Plot Data	5
Data Management	5
Unsupervised Image	6
Spatial Classifiers	6
Vegetation Maps	7
Forest-Canopy/Non-Forest Vegetation Complexes	7
Forest-Understory Complexes	7
Final Classification	7
Classification Accuracy	8
RESULTS	8
Nature and Spatial Distribution of Botanical Data	8
Summary Statistics for Full Botanical Plots	9
Vegetation Complexes	12
Forest-Canopy/Non-Forest Complexes	12
Forest-Understory Complexes	15
Vegetation Maps	19
Accuracy Assessment	26
User's Accuracy	26
Producer's Accuracy	26
Overall, Life Form, and Complex Group Map Accuracy	26
Spatial Accuracy	26
Vegetation Atlas: Ecological Descriptions of Mapped Complexes	35
Xeric Grasslands	36
Mesic Grasslands/Subalpine Meadows	38
Non-Sage Xeric Shrublands	40
Sage Xeric Shrublands	42
Xeric Shrublands	44
Mesic Shrublands	46
Herbaceous Riparian	48
Rock Dominated	50
Shrub-Herbaceous Dominated Burn	52
Conifer Regeneration Dominated Burn	54
Ponderosa Pine Dominant Forest	56
Douglas-Fir/Ponderosa Pine Co-Dominant Forest	58

Douglas-Fir Dominant Forest	60
Mixed Douglas-Fir Forest	62
Mixed Mesic Forest	64
Mixed Lodgepole Pine Forest	66
Mixed Subalpine Fir Forest	68
Mixed Whitebark Pine Forest	70
North Understory Complex 10	72
North Understory Complex 20	74
North Understory Complex 30	76
North Understory Complex 40	78
South Understory Complex 50	80
South Understory Complex 60	82
South Understory Complex 70	84
South Understory Complex 80	86
 DISCUSSION	88
Purpose of Map	88
Technical Objectives	88
Application	88
Interpretation of Map	89
Distribution of Training Data	89
Quality and Date of TM Data	89
Map Detail	90
Homogeneity of Mapped Complexes	90
Evaluating Map Accuracy	91
Mapping Forest Understory	92
Historical Context	92
Relation of Understory Complexes	92
Predictors of Understory	93
 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	94
 LITERATURE CITED	95

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Source and number of training plots used in the classification of the unsupervised image to forest-canopy, forest-understory, and non-forest vegetation complex, and “full” plots used to estimate plant species constancy, coverage, and related statistics.	9
2.	Forest-understory complex membership (northern classification) for all habitat types represented in the training set..	16
3.	Forest-understory complex membership (southern classification) for all habitat types represented in the training set.	17
4.	Ecological characterization and numeric code for the eight forest understory vegetation complexes mapped north and south of the edge-match boundary.	18
5.	Summary of statistical procedures used to classify polygons to vegetation complex.	19
6.	Estimated area (hectares and percent of region) of each mapped non-forest, forest-canopy, and forest-understory vegetation complex in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem.	20
7.	For each mapped forest-understory complex, the percentage of member polygons classified to each of the seven (north) or eight (south) possible forest-canopy complexes.	21
8.	For each mapped forest-understory complex, the percentage of field-assigned training plots that were (simultaneously) field-assigned to each of the seven (north) or eight (south) possible forest-canopy complexes.	21
9.	Complex-specific user’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation map north of the edge-match boundary	27
10.	Complex-specific user’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation map south of the edge-match boundary.	27
11.	Complex-specific user’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-understory/non-forest vegetation map north of the edge-match boundary.	28
12.	Complex-specific user’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-understory/non-forest vegetation map south of the edge-match boundary.	28
13.	Complex-specific producer’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation map north of the edge-match boundary.	29
14.	Complex-specific producer’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation map south of the edge-match boundary.	29
15.	Complex-specific producer’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-understory/non-forest vegetation map north of the edge-match boundary.	30
16.	Complex-specific producer’s accuracy (and error) matrix for the forest-understory/non-forest vegetation map south of the edge-match boundary	30
17.	Accuracy of classification to life form and various vegetation complex groups (e.g., forest-canopy, forest-understory, etc.) north and south of the edge-match boundary.	31

LIST OF FIGURES

1. The study area (TM scenes P41/R28 and P41/R29) in the context of major physiographic features and urban centers in Idaho and western Montana	3
2. Spatial distribution of training plots for the forest-canopy/non-forest classification	10
3. Spatial distribution of training plots used in the classification of forest polygons to forest-understory complex	11
4. Grouping scheme for the set of training data used to predict membership with respect to forest-canopy complex	13
5. Grouping scheme for the set of training data used to predict membership with respect to non-forest complex	14
6. Spatial distribution of nine forest-canopy and nine non-forest vegetation complexes in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem	22
7. Spatial distribution of eight forest-understory vegetation complexes in the Salmon-Selway ecosystem	23
8. A portion of the forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation map illustrating the structure and color-based labeling of individual polygons	24
9. A portion of the forest-understory/non-forest vegetation map illustrating the structure and color-based labeling of individual polygons	25
10. Contour map of overall accuracy in the classification of polygons to forest-canopy/non-forest vegetation complex	32
11. Contour map of overall accuracy in the classification of polygons to forest-understory/non-forest vegetation complex	33